

20th August 1925]

A.—(a), (d) & (e) An estimate for Rs. 30,95,600 for the water-supply scheme, excluding the cost of dam, tunnel, roadway, etc., has recently been sanctioned; also a subsidiary estimate for Rs. 15,300 for the improvement of the road up the valley. The estimates for the dam and tunnel are under final revision and are expected shortly. They may bring the total up to about Rs. 40 lakhs, but definite figures cannot be given yet. No actual construction has yet been done. Some pipes have been purchased and are being brought to site and work is being done on the road.

(b) Yes. The requests contained in the mahazars are—

- (1) The Government should bear the entire centage charges on the scheme.
- (2) The Government should bear three-fourths of the cost of the scheme.
- (3) The interest on the loan should be reduced and the period of repayment extended to 50 years.
- (4) The Agricultural and Forest Colleges, the Police Recruits School and the Central Jail should be included within the municipal limits.
- (5) No water-supply scheme is necessary for Coimbatore. The question as to whether any reduction can be made in the centage charges is under the consideration of the Government.

The Government have decided that the other requests cannot be complied with.

(c) The Municipal Council has proposed to levy a water and drainage tax of 8 per cent on the annual value of buildings and lands with effect from 1st October 1925. The Government are not aware that there is any movement in favour of a 5 per cent tax.

Alleged forcible vaccination of certain Adi-Dravida women of Selur near Ambur.

* 224 Q.—Mr. R. VEBERIAN : With reference to answer to question No. 542, dated 19th March 1925, regarding the alleged forcible vaccination of some Adi-Dravida women of Selur near Ambur, will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) whether the information said to have been called for has already been received; and

(b) if so, whether the Government will lay it on the table of this Council?

A.—(a) & (b) Yes.^a

Religious and Charitable Endowments.

Exclusion of non-Hindu endowments from the operation of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

* 225 Q.—Mr. K. RAGHUCHANDRA BALLAL : Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) what is the reason for the exclusion of non-Hindu endowments, such as Muhammadan and Christian, from the operation of the Madras Act I of 1925;

^a Printed as Appendix VIII on page 401 infra.

[20th August 1925]

(b) what is the special reason for providing the future applicability of the said Act I of 1925 only to Jain religious endowments; and

(c) why a similar provision was not made regarding other non-Hindu religious endowments?

A.—(a) & (c) Act I of 1925 is called the Madras Hindu Religious Endowments Act. It does not profess to apply to religious endowments other than Hindu. The Government have no reason to think that an Act is required at present to control endowments of the Christian, Muhammadan, or other religions not allied to Hinduism.

(b) Power was retained to extend the Act to Jain religious endowments owing to the near connexion between the Jain and Hindu religions.

The working of the Hindu Religious Endowments Act.

* 226 Q.—Mr. K. RAGHUCHANDRA BALLAL: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) when the Act I of 1925 came into force in the Presidency;

(b) whether the Act has been applied to all the districts and all classes of Hindu religious endowments without exception;

(c) when the Hindu Religious Endowments Board was brought into being and whether the Commissioners of that Board are to function under the said Act jointly or severally;

(d) why no Jain has been appointed as a Commissioner of the said Board;

(e) whether rules under the said Act have been framed and published in the *Port St. George Gazette*;

(f) what is the number of mutts and excepted temples over which the board has assumed control in the Presidency and in South Kanara;

(g) what is the number of non-excepted temples brought under the Act in the Presidency and in South Kanara;

(h) what is the total income of all the Hindu religious endowments brought under the Act; and

(i) whether any committees have been constituted for non-excepted temples in the Presidency and South Kanara; if so, what is their number; if not, why not?

A.—(a) 27th January 1925.

(b) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to sub-section (1) of section 2 of Act I of 1925.

(c) 10th February 1925; the question whether the Commissioners of the Board are to function jointly or severally is one to be regulated by by-laws made by the Board.

(d) Act I of 1925 does not apply to Jain Religious Endowments. There appears to be no necessity to appoint a Jain as Commissioner.

(e) The Committee appointed to frame rules under the Act has prepared a set of rules which is now under the consideration of Government.

(f), (g) & (h) The Government have no information.